

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 15 to 20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 7, and 15 to 20 are currently rejected.

Claim 1 is amended to further distinguish the claim from the referenced prior art.

Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 6, 7 and 15 to 20 as obvious over Sambell in view of Pender.

Sambell discloses 2 rotors each mounted on a pylon which is required to be moved rearward prior to movement of the blades (col. 4, lines 21-27). There is no pylon/mast movement required for blade movement in Applicant's invention.

Applicant claims "a transmission between the engines and the rotor equipped with a brake...". The Examiner states that Sambell col. 4, lines 39-55 "teach how the rotational velocity of the blades is reduced and halted, this mechanism acting as a braked." Forces "acting as a brake" are not the same as a physical brake which Applicant claims. In addition Sambell requires the mast to be rotated rearwardly "as the first step" (col. 4, lines 39-40) in the process to reduce speed. As stated above, Applicant does not require movement of the mast.

The method and aircraft claimed by Applicant includes a physical brake to halt the rotor rotation, to do so with the rotor blades resting in azimuthally position perpendicular to the flight path. This process is delicate and has to be made in such a way that the aerodynamic forces acting upon the blade, especially when the centrifugal forces are decreasing or disappearing due to the reduced rotational speed of the rotor, do not cause rotor blade breaking, especially in the last phase of the deceleration period when the rotor rotational speed is very low. In fact, the aerodynamic forces (in the upper

direction) in this phase of the braking interval, could lead to blade breaking unless appropriate actions are taken.

Examiner states that Sambell's statement: "the individual blades of the rotor assembly 32 tract independently to the stern in figs. 6-8," discloses applicant's step "retracting rotor blades towards a stern of the aircraft." Sambell does not disclose a method allowing this step to be performed without first moving the mast. Applicant does not claim or disclose a requirement (or provision) for movement of the mast.


Regarding claim 6, the Examiner states: "the blades when placed on the fixed wings as in fig. 1 and 8, are arranged such that the planes of the blades are substantially parallel to the plane of the wings."

Figures 1 and 8 of Sambell disclose the rotor blades in position parallel to the length of the fuselage. Applicant claims "**each** rotor blade is parallel to **one** fixed wing thus transitioning into a **biplane**" (emphasis added). Applicant believes any person skilled in the art of aircraft would recognize that the rotor blades parallel to the fuselage as disclosed in Sambell would not enable them to convert the aircraft into a biplane. But claim 6 is amended to further clarify Applicant's claims.

Claim 7 is amended to further distinguish the claim from the referenced prior art.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added. Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance and timely allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,

By: 
Donald J. Ranft
Reg. No. 53,501